DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 491 UD 012 371

AUTHOR Howard, Alan
TITLE Education in 'Aina Pumehana: the Hawaiian-American Student as a Hero. Final Draft.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the American Ethnological Society Meeting, Montreal, P.Q., April 5-9, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Cultural Factors; Cultural Interrelationships; Culture Contact; *Ethnic Groups; Ethnic Status; Ethnic Studies; *Interpersonal Relationship; Minority Groups; Psychology; Race Relations; Social Development; Social Integration; *Socialization; Social Relations; Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

Socialization patterns from a Hawaiian-American community are described in terms of the strategies and tactics utilized by Hawaiian-American children in dealing with the contingencies set for them first by their parents and later by teachers in the public school. Despite poor scholastic performance from the standpoint of educators, the viewpoint is presented that if one looks at the classroom as an interface between ethnic groups, then Hawaiian-American children can be considered heroes for defencing the core values of their culture against the onslaughts of an alien group. The data on which this paper is based were collected over a three-year period between 1965 and 1968 from a Hawaiian homestead community referred to by the pseudonym of "Aina Pumehana. The study was an interdisciplinary effort involving primarily social anthropology and psychology, but including researchers from several other disciplines as well. [This document has been reproduced from the best available copy.] (Author/SB)

ED 062491

FINAL DRAFT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EDUCATION IN 'AINA PUMEHANA: THE HAWAIIAN-AMERICAN STUDENT AS HERO*

ALAN HOWARD
East-West Population Institute
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

UD 012371

* Paper presented at American Ethnological Society meeting, Montreal, April 5-9, 1972.

ABSTRACT

Socialization patterns from a Hawaiian-American community are described in terms of the strategies and tactics utilized by Hawaiian-American children in dealing with the contingencies set for them first by their parents and later by teachers in the public school. Despite poor scholastic performance from the standpoint of educators, the viewpoint is presented that if one looks at the classroom as an interface between ethnic groups that Hawaiian-American children can be considered heroes for defending the core values of their culture against the onslaughts of an alien group.

Introduction

The data on which this paper is based were collected over a three-year period between 1965 and 1968 from a Hawaiian homestead community that I shall refer to by the pseudonym of 'Aina Pumehana.* The study was an interdisciplinary effort involving primarily social anthropology and psychology, but including researchers from several other disciplines as well. During the initial phases of research, information was gathered by participant observation and open-ended interviewing. In addition, under the supervision of Dr. Ronald Gallimore, a series of social psychological experiments were carried out in a local school with the goal of clarifying developmental processes lying behind Hawaiian-American character formation. During the second year of field work, we constructed a set of questionnaires for the purpose of gathering systematic data on a representative sample of adults in the community, as a means of clarifying and refining our ethnographic observations.

'Aina Pumehana is located on the Leeward side of Oahu, approximately thirty miles from Honolulu. It is one of several homesteads established under the provisions of the Hawaiian Homestead Act of 1920. In order to acquire a lease on homestead lands, individuals are required to demonstrate that they are 50 percent or more "Hawaiian" (i.e., Polynesian Hawaiian) by genealogical descent. Lessees are entitled to a plot of land ranging between 1/4 to one acre at a cost of $1 per year. They are also eligible for low interest home-building

* Research in 'Aina Pumehana was supported by grant number MH 15032 to B. P. Bishop Museum from the National Institute of Mental Health. The support of both institutions is gratefully acknowledged.

and home-improvement loans. In 1965, when we began our research, 394 lots were occupied in 'Aina Pumehana.

From a socio-economic point of view, 'Aina Pumehana may be characterized as a working class community. The majority of men are employed in semi-skilled or skilled blue-collar occupations, many of them commuting to Honolulu and its environs daily. A substantial minority of women also are employed. Unemployment rates in the community are generally higher than state-wide averages, and median income is comparatively low. The community, in fact, is part of a wider area that has been designated as "economically depressed" according to the standards of the state and federal governments, and over the past few years has been the "target" of several remedial programs, including the Economic Opportunity Act and Model Cities program.

Although lessees may be married to persons of less than 50 percent ancestry, the community is heavily weighted toward Hawaiian ethnicity and manifests a lifestyle that strongly reflects traditional Hawaiian values. Of paramount importance in the modal lifestyle is an emphasis on affiliative values and a devaluation of behavior oriented toward raising one's prestige vis-a-vis others. Although kinship ranking is important within family groupings, egalitarian pressures are very strong between nonkinsmen, and informal sanctions are brought to bear on those who flaunt their achievements or who seek public recognition. "We are like crabs in a basket," our informants frequently told us, "as soon as one begins to crawl out, the others

reach up to pull him back." Generosity and reciprocal exchange are normative values; this results in a disbursal of resources even during times when money is scarce, and is one of the major reasons why few Hawaiian-Americans accumulate material capital. The norm is to invest resources in social capital rather than to conserve. These values are reflected in a high frequency of large scale feasts, in frequent social gatherings and in numerous other group-oriented activities. They are reflected negatively in a low level of concern for such status symbols as ostentatious housing or prestige automobiles. There are an abundance of automobiles in the community but no Cadillacs or Lincolns, in contrast to many Ghetto communities on the mainland. In addition to traditional type feasts, or luaus, the strength of Hawaiian heritage within the community is reflected in a high incidence of adoption (see Howard et al., 1970) and in practices and beliefs related to the treatment of illness (Heighton, 1971). Nevertheless, 'Aina Pumehana is also very much a part of the modern socio-political system that is the United States and, more immediately, the State of Hawaii.

Perhaps more than any institution, the schools are purveyors of a contrasting set of values, those associated with middle-class Americana. This is accentuated by the fact that the State of Hawaii has a centralized school system, administered out of Honolulu, and dominated by persons of Caucasian and Japanese-American ancestry. Although 'Aina Pumehana parents continually express a fundamental concern for their children's education, their active participation in formulating school policies has been strongly discouraged by

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the central administration. The school is therefore very much of an alien institution in the community.

My approach in this paper will be a developmental one, and will focus on the contingencies faced by children as they grow up. Of central concern will be the discontinuities in these contingencies as children move from infancy to the toddler stage and then again as they enter the school system. The viewpoint I shall take involves trying to understand children's behavior in terms of the strategies and tactics they must use to cope with these contingencies. The use of concepts such as "strategies" and "tactics" represents an attempt to overcome the implication, so often present in socialization studies, that children are merely reactors to circumstances, rather than being active participants in the learning process. It is my belief that the view of children as mere respondents to adult manipulations not only distorts the actual situation, but also results in misguided educational programs.

Preschool Socialization Experience

During the ethnographic phase of our research we could not help but be struck by the degree to which young children are socially "present" in 'Aina Pumehana. Even casual visitors to the community remark about the ubiquity of children. As one drives down a homestead street they are playing together in front yards; at luaus and drinking parties children's sporadic shouts of glee, bickerings, and challenges are an inevitable part of the background. Even quite late at night, when their murmers have dissolved

into slumber, children are visible, sleeping on a mat in a corner of the room, or possibly in their mother's, father's, "auntie's" or someone else's arms.

We were also impressed by the apparent discontinuity between the indulgence of infants and rather harsh treatment afforded children after they become mobile (beginning at about two or three years old). This type of discontinuity was not unfamiliar to us; it has been described in detail by Ritchie and his associates for the New Zealand Maori (James Ritchie, 1956, 1963; Jane Ritchie, 1957), and has been a point of discussion among a number of psychologically-oriented field workers in Polynesia (see Levy, 1969). The overall pattern may be described as follows: During infancy, youngsters are tended to very closely. Much of their waking time is passed in someone's arms, being cuddled, played with and talked to. At family gatherings it is common practice for an infant to be passed from one to another; taking a baby to hold is perceived as a privilege rather than a responsibility, so that age takes preference. Usually it is the older women who monopolize a child, although over a period of time almost everyone--even teenage boys who may like to come on "tough" at times--is apt to be given an opportunity to indulge in fondling, cooing at and pacifying it. Although men, on the average, spend less time holding and cuddling an infant, the pleasure they display when they do so appears no less intense than the delight shown by women. At no time did we hear any male chide another for giving attention to an infant, nor did we obtain any other evidence that to do so is considered unmasculine. Quite the contrary--some of the hardest drinking, most belligerent men openly showed the greatest tenderness.

An infant is rarely allowed to cry for more than a few seconds before someone comes to provide relief. Mothers are pressured to do so; if a child is left crying other persons present show signs of distress. Speculations are made as to the cause of the baby's discomfort and other indirect cues are emitted to let the mother know that if she does not attend to the child's welfare immediately she is likely to be branded negligent. Consistent with this pattern is the practice of demand feeding. Although a few women reported attempts to establish a feeding schedule, they were almost invariably given up with a few days; the cries of a hungry baby were just too much to bear. Feeding an infant is more than just a means of providing nourishment, however. It has symbolic value in the sense that it provides a public display of nurturance, or concern for the child's welfare. Food was therefore offered to crying infants even when it seemed clear to field workers that the child was not hungry, but distressed for other reasons. There were even some reports of infants being fed when their distress was more than likely to be the result of overeating.

A parallel enthusiasm accompanies cleanliness care. Diapers are changed frequently (an informal count indicated an average of 24 per day for a small sample of mothers) and sometimes before soiling has occurred. One mother said she removed unsoiled diapers because the child "sweats and gets sore bottom if you don't change him." Another mother, when asked why she was removing an unsoiled diaper from a crying infant, remarked that a clean diaper might "make him feel better."

The general strategy of constant attention to and anticipation of an infant's needs is not accompanied by a proportionately high interest in maturation. Discussions of maturational indicators are rare, and with the exception of changes they find amusing or entertaining, most 'Aina Pumehana residents show little concern with a child's rate of advancement. For example, many parents do not encourage their children to walk and at times appear to discourage them from becoming mobile in order to reduce the possibility of injury. Even those who do seem to view children's attempts to walk with pride and interest, and encourage them to the extent that they provide supports or other forms of assistance for brief periods, do not encourage walking with the passion characteristic of middle-class Caucasians who see in such accomplishment an indication of personal achievement. In 'Aina Pumehana to make a display of one's child's accomplishments would be regarded as a vulgar attempt to show off. Then, too, indications are that parents are in no hurry to see their babies become toddlers. Thus the majority of a sample of 27 mothers, when asked at what age they liked children best, showed a distinct preference for infants around six months old.

As children become increasingly mobile and verbal, parental indulgence begins to give way to irritation and a lack of tolerance for insistent demands. The birth of a subsequent child is generally sufficient to create a marked shift in this direction, but even though no new infants are born (or adopted) into a household, a distinct change in parental behavior is noticeable as a child matures. Although some writers

have referred to this altered parental behavior as "rejection," I regard such a characterization as inappropriate, if not thoroughly inaccurate. A more acceptable view is that the change in parental response is related to an over-riding concern for rank and authority within the family. Thus, as long as children are passively dependent, their signals for attention are perceived as an expression of infantile need--as cues to be acted upon by nurturant adults. However, as children become increasingly mobile and verbal, and acquire the capacity for making more insistent and aggressive demands, their attention-seeking behavior is apt to be seen as an attempt to intrude and control. It is therefore an assault on the privileges of rank, for only the senior-ranking individual in an interaction has a right to make demands. By responding harshly parents are therefore socializing their children to respect the privileges of rank.

An additional factor may involve parents' own sensitivities to rejection. While a child is an infant and absolutely dependent upon parental nurturance for gratification of needs, he is unlikely to reject overtures; even if he does the rejection is not perceived as willful. But a child of two or three is capable of quite willfully rebuffing nurturant overtures, and Hawaiian-American parents, most of whom are extremely sensitive to such rebuffs, begin to find the relationship somewhat less attractive and are motivated to disengage from it to some degree. This, at least, is how we have interpreted the frequent remarks that children in the toddler stage "become too independent," or wistfully, "They begin to have a mind of their own."

Once the point of change has been reached, children are no longer the indulged center of attention they were as infants. They are removed to the fringes of the adult world, and much of the attention they receive is in the form of demands ("Go get me a glass of water") or admonishments ("Stop bothering me"). Thus children are faced with their initial strategic challenge--how to regain the indulgent rewards of their previously favored status. Quite naturally they rely on the tactics that paid off so handsomely before. They cry, whine, tug on parental clothing, try to climb into adult laps and otherwise attempt to take central stage in the social arena. These tactics may pay off some of the time during the transition period, and may therefore be perpetuated for a time, but they also draw increasingly harsh punishment.

As the risk of drawing punishment relative to the probability of obtaining rewards increases, children begin to explore new strategies and to seek substitute rewards. The strategy that appears to pay off best under these circumstances is to yield the privilege of initiating interactions to one's parents. This not only has the effect of reducing reactive punishment, it also has the advantage of confining interactions to occasions when parental needs are salient.

A frequent parentally initiated interaction (i. e., one not triggered by a child's intrusion or misbehavior) is in the form of demands for service or task performance. Children are asked to fetch something for a parent, to convey messages, to check on the whereabouts of a family member, etc.

Parents also begin to assign tasks such as sweeping up, clearing the dinner table, emptying the rubbish and cleaning the yard at an early age; in some cases assignments are made as the chores arise, in others they are regularly scheduled. These demands provide children with an opportunity to gain highly desired parental approval, and most children eagerly respond when called upon. Rewards are likely to come in a muted form compared with earlier indulgences--a smile or playful pat, a joke, or maybe an opportunity to sit on a lap for a few minutes. Rarely is overt praise or lavish attention given. But the degree to which children cherish even these muted displays of affection is obvious from the way that their faces light up in response. In addition to demands, there are times a parent may simply feel like being nurturant, or may wish to publicly demonstrate that he loves his children, but there is little that a child can do to promote such circumstances. The most he can do is tune into his parents' expressive codes, so that he can accurately judge when it might pay off to make himself socially visible and when he is better off to stay out of sight. Some children learn to inhibit completely responses, like crying, that previously brought indulgence but now can be counted on to be ignored at best, severely punished at worst. We noticed, however, that when someone (like a field worker) dispenses unconditional rewards, even the older children tend to disinhibit very rapidly and are all over him with very strong demands for attention. The tactic of coming on strong thus remains, for most Hawaiian-Americans, in reserve, to be called upon when threats of admonishment or punishment are removed.

With the promise of parental rewards drastically reduced, children begin to seek the attention of their siblings and peers. Their relations with older siblings parallel to a certain degree their relations with parents; older siblings have authority over them and have power to reward and punish, though to a lesser degree than parents. They are likely to permit more intrusiveness than parents and continue to reward demands for attention for some time after the latter have withdrawn them. However they are also more likely to be erratic in meting out punishment, sometimes using scoldings or beatings as a means of communicating their social power to the child and their peers. Nevertheless, relations with siblings tend to be much more relaxed than with parents once a child has become fully mobile and verbal. It is with siblings that children learn the value of such strategies as joking, i.e., turning a potentially threatening situation into one of play. If they can induce an angry older sibling to laugh by giggling, clowning or otherwise projecting cues appropriate to a play context, they are likely to be successful in reducing the degree of punishment, or even in fending it off completely. With parents this strategy is not apt to be successful since they are less susceptible to being drawn into games than children. Thus it seemed to us that Hawaiian-American children learned to rely on a joking, game-type strategy to cope with potential threats to a greater degree than middle-class Caucasian children, precisely because their parents relegated more control to older siblings.

The social ranking inherent in parent-child and sibling relations recedes into the background with peers, although some weight is still given to relative age. It is with peers that the joking strategy comes to full fruition. Serious competitiveness, attempts to gain dominance and strong demands for attention are all likely to be met with indignation or anger, perhaps because social interaction would be nearly impossible should all the latent cravings for attention be permitted to surface. Joking, or to be more precise, tacitly agreeing not to take anything seriously except the most grievous offenses, thus becomes the prime social lubricant, beginning in early childhood and extending through adult life. Reciprocity also has its firmest roots in peer relations. Although most Hawaiian-American parents stress equal sharing among their children, this is an imposed contingency from the latter's point of view. In relations with peers, reciprocity assumes a positive strategic value of a somewhat different order. By willingly sharing what he has with peers a child learns that he is more likely to obtain a reasonable distribution of rewards through time, for his peers will more willingly share what they have with him. In a community in which parental resources are limited, and parental rewarding sporadic, such a strategy has a high payoff in terms of overall utility. Reciprocity also contributes to an egalitarian group atmosphere and an atmosphere of easy sociability. Thus, even before a child has reached kindergarten age, he is likely to have learned to rely on the basic strategies that mark the Hawaiian-American social style.

School: The Struggle for Control

By all the statistical standards customarily used by educators--scores on achievement tests, rates of dropping out, etc.--the children of 'Aina Pumehana are educational failures. To give just one indicator, in 1966 approximately 70% of the tenth grade students from 'Aina Pumehana fell below the 25th percentile on standardized tests of achievement. Not only educators are disturbed by this level of performance; the children's parents are equally concerned, for they value education greatly and have high ambitions for their offspring. But the question I wish to raise is whether the children have in fact failed when one examines their performance from the standpoint of the values and behavioral styles they bring to the schools. My thesis is that far from being failures, from some perspectives they must be regarded as highly successful, for they continually win battles with their teachers for control over their lives, in large part because the strategies and tactics they use are far more effective than those used against them. Indeed, they might be viewed as the most potent soldiers Hawaiian-American culture has in its defense against the onslaught of middle-class Americana.

To begin with, we might point to the issue of language. The language of the community is usually labeled as "pidgin English," although it might more properly be described as a colloquial dialect involving a large number of loan words, primarily from Hawaiian. For years this dialect was considered "substandard" English by educators in Hawaii, and

vigorous attempts were made to stamp it out. More recently official attitudes have softened, but most teachers still find it difficult to see the colloquial dialect as anything but substandard English. The dialect is, in fact, a richly developed expressive code, well-suited to interaction based on easy sociability, but it has a simpler grammar and denotative vocabulary than standard English. It also varies phonologically from standard English. The children, of course, must use the local dialect to communicate effectively with their family and friends, so if forced to choose will favor it nearly every time. At least three levels of communicative disturbance are involved when a teacher insists on standard English and on making the local dialect a target of ridicule and derision. At the simple overt level, there is phonological interference between the two speech modalities (Boggs, in press). There is also differential emphasis with regard to codes, the children emphasizing an expressive code, the teachers a denotative code. Finally, at an attitudinal level, the teacher communicates a message of disdain for the children's speech capabilities and by extension, for their cultural values and background. That a majority of the children refuse to adopt standard English as a replacement for the local dialect might be interpreted, therefore, as a strategic victory--as a successful defense of their language, values and cultural lifestyle. From one standpoint, at least, they deserve great credit for resisting a highly financed, technologically potent attempt to brainwash them.

But the battle extends well beyond the mere use of language, which in some respects is more symptomatic than central. The core of the struggle

really revolves around the issue of social influence. If teachers are to be successful in patterning children's behavior (i.e., teaching them things), they must be capable of directing the children's attention and providing meaningful rewards for approved performances. This, our observations have led us to believe, most teachers in the schools we studied are unable to do. Their influence strategies are ineffective and self-defeating, so they accuse the students of being inattentive, more interested in playing around than learning, and of being generally unmotivated. To fully appreciate the nature of the conflict, we must expand our description of preschool socialization by addressing the question, "How do Hawaiian-American parents control their children, and what do the children learn as a consequence?" or more directly, "What is the nature of the social influence process that Hawaiian-American children must adapt to within their families?"

Our observations made it clear to us that although parents rely heavily upon punishment of unwanted behavior in order to control their children, the number of areas in which demands are made upon a child is relatively limited, since the child is trained early to seek help from siblings and peers, or to help himself. In fact, then, the frequency of punishment is likely to be low since the number of interactions with parents tends to become increasingly restricted. Rewards are dispensed from time to time, but generally on a noncontingent basis. What seems to be distinct about the meting out of punishment, in comparison with the middle-class American pattern, is the degree to which it is personalized. That is, children are scolded or "given

a licking" for unwarranted intrusions or for failing to comply with parental demands, but almost never for failing to achieve a standard that is impersonally valued. Within this system parental inattentiveness serves as a form of reinforcement in the sense that it signals to the child that his behavior is acceptable. By dispensing rewards on a noncontingent basis, parents communicate to a child that they, and not he, have a right to control the nature of their interactions. It is as though parents realize that if they made rewards contingent they would be opening themselves to manipulation, and in effect yielding some control of the relationship to their children. In light of the value emphasis placed on respect for rank and authority within the family, this would be an undesirable outcome.

Thus Hawaiian-American children, unlike their middle-class Caucasian counterparts, are not trained to respond to parental inattentiveness with attempts to secure a rewarding response. Only when parents signal that they are in a nurturant mood do children orient to them and begin to activate behavioral forms that were previously rewarded. For example, a child imitates the antics of a wrestler on a television to which his parents respond with amusement and joking, perhaps even approving, comments. He is likely to continue until his parents show signs of irritation or otherwise signal him to stop. When this happens, the child's best strategy is to "disappear," to transform himself into a "nonperson" in his parents' social field. Only in this limited sense do parents provide reinforcements for specific acts of behavior. In order to maximize rewards and minimize punishments, a child

must learn to actively engage his parents only when they are in a nurturant mood, to disengage when they show signs of irritation or annoyance, and to remain unobtrusively attentive the rest of the time.

Our experimental data supported this formulation. Following a period of isolation, Hawaiian-American children were less attentive to an experimental task presented to them than a control group who were exposed to a period of warm interaction with the experimenter. This result, which is the opposite of that obtained under similar experimental conditions from middle-class Caucasian children, we hypothesized to be the result of Hawaiian-American children learning to attend to cues more closely when adults have signalled that they are in a nurturant mood (see Howard, in press).

If we shift our perspective to that of the child and the contingencies he must cope with in responding to parents, we arrive at the following formulation:

A. When parents are punitive or critical, a child's best strategy is to withdraw, avoid, or inhibit. Under such circumstances there is little point in being attentive because the additional information provided by parental cues is of little utility; nothing he can do is likely to elicit a rewarding response. As a result, task performance can be expected to decrease when children raised in this mode have been criticized or subjected to disapproval.

B. When parents are in a nurturant mood, it pays the child to be maximally attentive, for scarce rewards are most likely to be obtained under such conditions. The value of rewards obtained is comparatively greater than

for middle-class children precisely because they are not as freely dispensed. Therefore task performance can be expected to increase following periods of nurturance and social approval.

C. When parents are paying no attention to a child, his best strategy is to remain unobtrusive, but observant to cues that signal the vicissitudes of parental moods. Should he discover a shift toward nurturance, it may pay to enter their social field; a shift toward anger or sullenness is a cue to withdraw completely. Parental neutrality is therefore associated with an intermediate level of children's attentiveness. We would expect intermediate levels of task performance in the absence of either marked approval or disapproval.

With the promise of parental rewards substantially reduced, a child's best strategy is to turn to siblings and peers for primary interpersonal gratifications. It is the salience of the peer group in this early period that appears to generate an overriding concern for affiliation in the Hawaiian-American subculture. As parents recede into the peripheries of a child's social field, the relative value of pleasing them with achievement or accomplishment diminishes in comparison with the pleasures of peer group sociability. In combination, this leads to a reluctance to make one's self vulnerable by socially engaging persons of unknown disposition, particularly if they are of higher rank or social standing (as teachers are); a higher value being placed on sociability and affiliation than on personal achievement; and a greater concern for social rewards than for living up to "standards of

excellence," with correspondingly more value being placed on rewards dispensed by others in comparison with self-rewards. We were not only able to validate these observations by social psychological experiments, but were also able to demonstrate that such learning experiences are related to the salience of Need affiliation as a spur to achieving behavior rather than Need achievement, and a concern for accumulating social capital (i.e., an expanded network of interpersonal commitment) rather than material resources.

How does this type of social learning history affect interaction in classrooms structured on the premise that children must primarily attend and orient to teachers for effective learning to take place? The answer seems to be that a struggle ensues in which teachers wheedle, cajole, threaten and use all the other influence tactics that work so well with middle-class Caucasian children, while the students employ such behavioral forms as tactical passivity, initiation of activity with peers and ignoring teachers' overtures. A summary statement is provided by Gallimore, Boggs, and MacDonald (1968):

> Generally, children do not like to pay attention, as a group, to instructions given by the teacher, and they almost never listen closely to instructions the first several times they are given. Nevertheless, teachers spend a great deal of time trying to get the children's attention in order to switch them from one activity to another. Teachers have a number of rituals which they employ for this purpose--such as, switching the lights off until all are quiet and ready to begin another activity, playing "Simon says" with such words as "Put books away," "Be quiet," or suggesting, "Let's see if you can hear the pin drop," and many others. Sometimes children enjoy these games and they are often bored by harangues which are intended to accomplish the same purpose. Either way, when the new activity is supposed to begin, the majority have little conception of what is to be done.

Most of the time children are much more strongly oriented toward other children than they are toward adults. They help one another very readily, copy one another's work, and are very sensitive to being outdone by others. . . .

A frequent result of the lack of attention to the teacher's instructions and positive orientation toward other children is that children attempt to do the assignment by copying. More rarely, they may ask questions of other classmates.

Helping one another does not mean sharing possessions, like pencils. There are frequently bitter arguments about this, and a child will rarely yield a pencil to another, even when commanded to do so. In general, children frequently are very "touchy" toward one another, and brief but bitter fights are not uncommon. Whether helping or fighting, however, children most often act as if adults were not present, and other children were the primary source of all gratification and frustration.

The typical classroom works against the powerful peer-affiliation motive which appears to operate in Hawaiian social groups. To diminish the strength of this motive may be futile, at least if one employs a head-on attack--that is, by punitive means in the early grades. Second, and related, the punitive measures used in the attempt to eliminate attending to peers and to encourage attending to the teacher have the effect of increasing passivity, withdrawal, and avoidance. Hawaiian parents train their children to respond to negative sanctions with respect and obedience, and not with active attempts to alter the parents' response. If an Hawaiian parent scolds his child, the child is likely to go to the bedroom, or outside, and remain there until the

incident becomes history. Children of certain other cultural groups are more likely to follow a scolding with an active attempt to obtain parental approval and, in general, to seek praise and verbal approval.

Among Hawaiian youngsters, however, many of the social-influence techniques which are verbal in nature are ineffective since children seem largely indifferent and inattentive to adult talk, unless it is deliberately entertaining, or directed at them individually. They do not know what to make of verbal praise; it is at best meaningless to them. Protestations of affection, or the withdrawal of affection, are not understood. A teacher's threat of becoming angry is likely to be ignored unless it means that he will very soon use physical punishment--that is what an adult's anger means to a child, not the withdrawal of affection.

They respond warmly to being touched and held, arm around shoulders, or spoken to eye to eye. They also respond to a firm, individually directed scolding, especially if accompanied by a gruff but affectionate gesture. They are sensitive at times to adult approval and anger. When seeking to make recompense to an adult, the most typical act is to engage in some helpful chore. Unless the adult appreciates the intent of this, the child is likely to feel rebuffed. (pp. 36-38)

Only a part of the children's response can be interpreted as a negative reaction against teachers' attempts to control and influence them. They actively strive to restructure classroom interaction patterns into a system more compatible with their previous experience, although teachers rarely recognize these attempts for what they are and usually label such behavior as disruptive. An insight into this process is provided by Boggs (in press), in a recent paper inquiring into "The Meaning of Questions and Narratives to Hawaiian Children." He points out that Hawaiian-American children strive to turn their relationships with teachers into collective ones when verbal interchanges such as questions and answers are involved. "A collective relationship with an adult," he suggests, "seems to be equivalent

to relationships among children, so far as patterns of communication are concerned." He reports that, "the response of children when questioned in class has the effect of shifting dyadic relations to collective ones," and states that, "the reason may be that the child finds protection in collective relationships with adults." Boggs summarizes his findings in the form of a rule: "Other children can be queried, answered and talked to at any time, and so can adults when relating to a group of children."

The implication is that when a teacher is willing to interact with children collectively, and permits children to interact with one another, that verbal exchanges are extensive and rich in content, and that children are attentive to the social interactions around them. Boggs' observations, as well as numerous other observations by our field workers, overwhelmingly support the inference that optimal learning takes place in such a social environment.

Unfortunately, many teachers interpret children's efforts to convert dyadic adult-child interactions into collective ones as a form of classroom disruption.* They see the children's behavior as willfully inattentive and undisciplined. If they are "weak" teachers, they often simply give up trying to teach the children anything, in exchange for a modicum of orderliness.

---

* Gallimore reports, on the basis of systematic classroom observation, a difference in the frequency of "working alone" and "working in groups" between Hawaiian-American and middle-class Caucasian classrooms, but a marked similiarity in the frequency of working behavior in contrast with other behavioral categories. Unfortunately many teachers categorize "working in groups" as disruptive behavior and punish it (personal communication).

If they are "strong" teachers, they may resort to authoritarian strategies that approximate those of the children's parents. In the latter case, students may respond by being overtly obedient but thoroughly disengaged from scholastic activities in the classrooms; they rely on behavioral forms such as tactical passivity and self-removal from the social scene as a means of minimizing expected punishment. There are an intermediate group of teachers who attempt to be authoritarian, but whose teaching strategies and disciplinary techniques are so ineffective that the children do not take them seriously. In their classrooms, children interact with one another at will, and ignore the teacher's threats and overtures to gain attention.

Boggs reports that observations in several classrooms comprised of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian teen-agers in other parts of the state "suggest that the success of teaching techniques is related to whether or not they take advantage of the behavior patterns which have been described. One observer writes as follows of a teacher, herself part-Hawaiian, who succeeds in eliciting extensive communication from a class of such students:

> There was no direct questioning of individual students and most questions were asked of the entire group. All responses were absolutely voluntary; no one was forced to say anything. Voluntary responses were very good, and often students would blurt out an experience or an answer without being recognized by the teacher. There were instances when students talked continuously without being recognized.*
>
> *Observations by Edison M. C. Chong, term paper for Anthropology 480(3), December, 1969." (as reported in Boggs, in press)

This teacher, Boggs points out, is taking advantage of the children's preference for relating to adults as a group, and is using it creatively (ibid.). However, the proportion of teachers employing such a strategy is appallingly low; it is simply too different from institutionalized teaching concepts to be acceptable to many of them.

Conclusion

From the standpoint of educators, the kinds of behavior exhibited by Hawaiian-American children are, at best, an unfortunate impediment to a sound education. Such a view is based on the premise that children need to learn requisite skills in order to survive in our dominant society, and that unless they learn to orient toward teachers and the tasks required of them, they will not learn properly. However, if one looks at the same situation as an interface between ethnic groups, the Hawaiian-American children we have observed might rightfully be labeled as "heroes," for they are defending the core values of their culture against the onslaughts of an alien group. Even though they cannot verbalize it, their behavior may well be interpreted as a communicative statement to the effect that "it isn't worth it; we will not give up our basic commitments to peers, to affiliation, to our general lifestyle, for what you are offering."

Does this mean that future generations of Hawaiian-American children will be forced to fight for their cultural integrity as the present generation has had to do? Are Hawaiian-American parents going to be continually

denied the privilege of seeing their children get a good education? The answer to these questions lie not within the Hawaiian-American community, as so many educators would like us to believe, but within the structure and values of the school system itself. It is the educational system that has created the need for battle; the children have merely responded valiantly. I fear, though, that most of the questions educators are asking in response to current crises are more in the spirit of, "How can we improve our battle techniques?" than in the more appropriate frame of, "How can we avoid the battle?"

There are no inherent impediments in the Hawaiian-American learning style, but until the dominant educational system accepts the validity of divergent values and lifestyles, I can only add my encouragement to the battle being waged by the students in 'Aina Punehana schools. Until schools change, I can only be sympathetic with the combat cry of "Geeve 'em, bruddah!"

References

Boggs, Stephen T. The meaning of questions and narratives to Hawaiian children. To be published (in press) in C. Cazden, D. Hymes and V. John (eds.), The Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Columbia Teachers College Press.

Gallimore, Ronald; Boggs, Stephen T.; & MacDonald, W. Scott. Education. In R. Gallimore and A. Howard (eds.), Studies in a Hawaiian Community: Na Makamaka O Nanakuli. PAR #1, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, 1968, pp. 36-38.

Heighton, Robert H., Jr. Hawaiian supernatural and natural strategies for goal attainment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, 1971.

Howard, Alan; Heighton, Robert H., Jr.; Jordan, Cathie; & Gallimore, Ronald. Traditional and modern adoption patterns in Hawaii. In V. Carroll (ed.), Adoption in Eastern Oceania. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1970.

Ritchie, James E. Basic personality in Rakau. Publications in Psychology, #8. Wellington, New Zealand, Victoria University of Wellington, 1956.

Ritchie, James E. The making of a Maori. Publications in Psychology, #15. Wellington, New Zealand, Victoria University of Wellington, A. H. & A. W. Reed, 1963.

Ritchie, Jane. Childhood in Rakau. Publications in Psychology, #10. Wellington, New Zealand, Victoria University of Wellington, 1957.

Levy, Robert I. Personality studies in Polynesia and Micronesia: stability and change. Social Science Research Institute Working Paper #8. University of Hawaii, 1969.